

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 26 April 2021**b. Date Received:** 26 April 2021**c. Counsel:** None**2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:**

a. Applicant's Requests and Issues: The current characterization of service for the period under review is honorable. The applicant requests a narrative reason change.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, their separation was unjust due to being undiagnosed, untreated, and unfairly targeted for discharge. After multiple combat tours in Iraq, the applicant was assigned to a recruiting command unfamiliar with combat-related PTSD, leading to misdiagnosis, improper medication management, and administrative separation instead of treatment. The applicant contends being misdiagnosed by both civilian and Army medical personnel, prescribed multiple medications, and placed in and out of counseling, worsening their condition. Instead of receiving appropriate medical care, the applicant was demoted and discharged despite having reenlisted for five additional years upon returning from Iraq. The applicant requests a change of their DD Form 214, including removing the SPD code and Narrative Reason and restoring their rank to E-5, as the demotion was unjust. Given their combat record and intent to continue serving, the applicant believes their separation and rank reduction were improper and seeks correction.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 16 June 2025, and by a 3-2 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder outweighing the applicant's offenses of illegal substance abuse, FTR, and various dereliction infractions. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of a change to the narrative reason for separation to Pattern of Misconduct with a corresponding separation code of JKA. The Board determined the reentry code is proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

*Please see **Board Discussion and Determination** section for more detail regarding the Board's decision. Board member names available upon request.*

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c / JKQ / RE-3 / Honorable

b. Date of Discharge: 7 September 2011**c. Separation Facts:**

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 17 July 2011 / The acknowledgement letter reflects the applicant refused to sign.

(2) Basis for Separation: The applicant was informed of the following reasons: On 26 May 2011, the applicant tested positive for marijuana. The applicant failed to report at the prescribed time on multiple occasions to the appointed place of duty at the Planet Fitness Gym for PT and at 1400 hours for duty at Recruiting Station. The applicant was derelict in the

performance of duties by willfully failing to replicate three times a day, failing to keep the planner completed for two weeks in advance, and failing to make contact with the Team Leader after school visits. The applicant violated USAREC Regulation 700-5, 2-4e(4), dated 15 December 2008, by wrongfully driving a government-owned vehicle to their residence. With intent to deceive, the applicant made a false official statement to a senior NCO, claiming they took their child to be with their ex-spouse, knowing the statement to be false. Additionally, the applicant failed to answer the government-issued cell phone from 0730 until after 1000 hours on 1 June 2009 and failed to report to the appointed place of duty for the Company change of command.

(3) Recommended Characterization: General (Under Honorable Conditions)

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 21 June 2011

(5) Administrative Separation Board: On 18 July 2011, the applicant was notified to appear before an administrative separation board and advised of rights.

On 8 August 2011, the applicant conditionally waived consideration of the case before an administrative separation board contingent upon receiving a characterization no less favorable than honorable.

On 10 August 2011 the conditional waiver was approved.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 10 August 2011 / Honorable

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 2 July 2008 / 9 years, 6 months, 7 days

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 24 / High School Graduate / 121

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-5 / 25U14, Signal Support System Specialist / 9 months, 6 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: USAR, 19 September 2001 – 25 April 2004 / HD
ADT, 10 September 2001 – 12 April 2002 / HD
(Concurrent Service)
RA, 26 April 2004 – 1 July 2008 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Germany, SWA / Iraq (24 July 2004 – 3 September 2004; 20 September 2004 – 4 April 2005; 31 October 2006 – 12 December 2007)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM-2, AAM-2, AGCM-2, NDSM, GWOTSM, ICM-CS, NCOPD, ASR, CAB

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Electronic Copy of Specimen Custody Document – Drug Testing, 6 June 2011, reflects the applicant tested positive for THC (marijuana) during an Inspection Random (IR) urinalysis testing conducted on 26 May 2011.

Incident Information Report, 7 June 2011, reflects the applicant tested positive for THC as stated above. This report also reflects the command was in the process of revisiting the applicant's chapter packet and rescinding the suspension of lost rank from a previous Article 15

for misconduct. Previous to this incident the applicant was command referred to Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP).

Record of Supplementary Action Under Article 15, UCMJ, 13 June 2011, reflects the command vacated the suspension of reduction in rank imposed on 21 April 2011. The applicant was reduced to E-4 on 21 April 2011.

Appeal of Recommendation to Receive a General under Honorable Conditions Discharge and Request for Administrative Board Hearing Memorandum, 24 June 2011, reflects a statement by the applicant arguing why they should not receive a general discharge. The applicant mentioned how the initiating incident should be viewed as an isolated event due to being punished for prior incidents. The applicant also mentions how they had not received any help from ASAP or the command in regard to their mental health and rehabilitative treatment despite directly requesting help. The applicant states they informed their counselor of their self-medicating with drugs and alcohol as a coping strategy, and nothing was done. The applicant mentions not receiving any follow up ASAP treatment. The applicant states they were targeted through repeated urinalysis testing. The applicant asserts they were denied voluntary ASAP treatment and the mandatory referral timeline was not followed. The applicant also states the ASAP counselor did not contact the unit commander nor initiate a formal referral on DA Form 8003 for their self-referral.

Email Thread, 3 August 2011, reflects a conversation between the unit commander and brigade judge advocate in reference to the administrative separation board member change and "Operation Baby Watch" to "Operation Baby Birth". It is unclear why a baby was mentioned in reference to the applicant's separation board.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: VA Medical Center letter, 8 July 2011, reflects the response to concerns regarding the applicant's referral and screening process for substance abuse treatment at a VA Medical Center (VAMC). The Psychology Service reviewed the records to address these concerns. The applicant was referred to the VAMC on 21 June 2011, for screening for the Substance Abuse Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Program (SAR RTP). Staff attempted to contact the applicant between 21 and 23 June 2011 but were unsuccessful. Messages were left requesting a return call to complete the screening. On 28 June 2011, staff successfully contacted the applicant and completed the telephone screening, determining eligibility and identifying the need for residential treatment. Following the screening, VAMC staff coordinated with the applicant and their command to facilitate admission. They also engaged with the Army's Psychological Consultant, who confirmed as long as the applicant was seeking treatment for substance abuse, the Army would support participation, pending approval from the Army's substance abuse treatment program. With command authorization, the applicant would be able to receive substance abuse treatment at the VAMC. Additionally, staff planned to coordinate screening for any other necessary services.

VA Congressional Response, 8 July 2011, reflects the response to an inquiry regarding the applicant's allegations of inadequate medical treatment for PTSD, lack of follow-up care, racial and gender discrimination, harassment, and unfair disciplinary actions. A commander's inquiry, involving the Inspector General's office, Brigade Judge Advocate, and Equal Opportunity Representative, was conducted to investigate these claims. The findings indicate the applicant was diagnosed with Depressive Disorder Not Otherwise Specified, alcohol abuse, and cannabis abuse, but not PTSD. After reporting homicidal and suicidal thoughts during a mental health appointment, the applicant was referred to Lincoln Trail Behavioral Health, where they received

29 days of treatment and counseling. Upon discharge, the applicant was evaluated by the brigade psychologist and confirmed to have depression, alcohol, and drug abuse, but not PTSD. During treatment, the applicant tested positive for marijuana and was subsequently enrolled in the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP) on 6 April 2011. However, they failed rehabilitation training due to another positive urinalysis for THC on 26 May 2011. Regarding disciplinary action, the applicant was punished for a pattern of misconduct, resulting in a reduction in rank and forfeiture of pay. Initially, part of the punishment was suspended, contingent upon compliance with regulations for 180 days. However, due to the subsequent positive drug test, the full punishment was enforced. The applicant also filed an informal Equal Opportunity (EO) complaint on 15 March 2011, regarding the use of racially derogatory and sexist slurs within the unit. The EO advisor informed them of formal and informal resolution options. The applicant opted for an informal complaint, requesting the derogatory behavior cease. The EO advisor notified the chain of command to address the issue.

VA PTSD Referral Memorandum, 1 August 2011, reflects a confirmation of the applicant's treatment recommendations at the VA Medical Center. The treatment team recommended continued residential care through the D track of the PTSD Residential Treatment Program, which integrates treatment for PTSD and substance abuse. The program includes an initial 22-day stay, with the possibility of an additional six weeks if intensive treatment is deemed necessary at the end of the initial phase.

VA Rating document, 9 January 2019, reflects the applicant was granted a service connections rating of 70 percent for PTSD with TBI.

History and Physical Report, 15 January 2009, reflects the applicant was given several medications. The document also reflects the applicant's history with adapting to society post deployment.

Outpatient Psychotherapy letter, 22 March 2011, reflects a summary of outpatient psychotherapy sessions attended by the applicant for both individual and marital/family counseling. The applicant was seen on multiple dates between July 2009 and March 2010, though some sessions were missed due to work conflicts. The initial reason for seeking counseling was to improve the marital relationship and prepare for full custody of a child in an unsafe living situation. During the initial sessions, the applicant reported symptoms of depression, including lack of energy, sadness, difficulty sleeping, trust issues, and difficulty maintaining consistency in relationships. The applicant also disclosed experiencing the loss of a friend during an IED attack in Iraq in 2007. The therapist recommended consulting a physician to consider medication for depression. Treatment goals focused on improving communication with the spouse, integrating into the community, and parenting strategies. However, inconsistent attendance made progress difficult, and sessions were eventually discontinued. The therapist was later informed the applicant had entered a treatment facility for service-related emotional issues and expressed support for this decision.

Equal Opportunity Complaint, 16 March 2011, reflects formal complaint of unlawful discrimination, harassment, and unfair treatment within the applicant's chain of command. The applicant reported experiencing racial and gender discrimination, a hostile work environment, and retaliation from leadership after seeking medical assistance for PTSD. Despite expressing concerns about mental health and requesting referrals for treatment, leadership failed to provide timely support or resources. Instead, the applicant was subjected to excessive written counseling statements, public ridicule, and threats regarding career progression. The applicant attempted to seek PTSD treatment through Military One Source and VA services, but leadership failed to provide proper guidance. When the applicant sought assistance from the Equal Opportunity (EO) office, the chain of command discouraged filing a complaint and attempted to

suppress efforts to report the ongoing discrimination. The applicant's spouse and parent also raised concerns with the brigade chaplain and the Inspector General's (IG) office, further highlighting the lack of leadership support. Additionally, the applicant reported inconsistencies in disciplinary actions, noting other Soldiers engaged in similar or more severe misconduct without facing consequences. Despite commendable performance, previous positive evaluations, and contributions to mission success, the applicant was overlooked for promotion and unfairly targeted for disciplinary action, including an Article 15. The applicant was ultimately diagnosed with PTSD and admitted to a 28-day residential treatment program, further proving the legitimacy of mental health concerns. However, the applicant was subjected to degrading treatment, including unnecessary escort policies and restrictions on family accommodations during medical appointments. The applicant's experiences demonstrate a failure by leadership to recognize PTSD symptoms, provide appropriate medical referrals, and ensure fair and equitable treatment.

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

The ARBA's medical advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records, including documents listed in 4j(1) and (2) above.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: Memorandum for Commander; Request for Conditional Waiver; Election of Rights; VA Congressional Response; Congressman Response; Senate Memorandum; VA PTSD team referral Memorandum; Separation Authority Memorandum; two Certificates of Release or Discharge from Active Duty; ADRB email; Correction to DD Form 214; VA Rating; AIT Diploma; four Certificates of Achievement; National Guard Ribbon Certificate; National Guard Ribbon Orders; National Guard Honorable Discharge Certificate; National Guard Honorable Discharge Orders; Range Card; three Recommendations for Award; Photo in dress uniform; three Certificates of Training; Promotion Orders; Recommendation for Green to Gold; Recruiter Badge Orders; Basic Recruiter Badge with one Gold Star Orders; Driver Badge Orders; History and Physical Report; No Driving Doctor letter; Outpatient Psychotherapy letter; Spouse letter; Parent letter; Formal EO Complaint; Article 15 Appeal; Spouse email to commander; 1SG and Commander email; Email to TRADOC; three third-party letters; NCOER; two Enlisted Record Briefs; seven photos; College Grade Report; ARBA application Review letter.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with the application.

7. STATUTORY, REGULATORY AND POLICY REFERENCE(S):

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

b. Multiple Department of Defense Policy Guidance Memoranda published between 2014 and 2018. The documents are commonly referred to by the signatory authorities' last names (2014 Secretary of Defense Guidance [Hagel memo], 2016 Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Carson memo], 2017 Official Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Kurta memo], and 2018 Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Wilkie memo].

(1) Individually and collectively, these documents provide further clarification to the Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharge due to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Liberal consideration will be given to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Special consideration will be given to Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) determinations that document a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in a less than honorable discharge characterization. Special consideration will also be given in cases where a civilian provider confers diagnoses of a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment if the case records contain narratives supporting symptomatology at the time of service or when any other evidence which may reasonably indicate that a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment existed at the time of discharge might have mitigated the misconduct that caused a discharge of lesser characterization.

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board) sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations) provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

(1) Chapter 3, Section II provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(2) Paragraph 3-7a states an Honorable discharge is a separation with honor and is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier's service generally has met the standards of

acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

(3) Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, and commission of a serious offense, to include abuse of illegal drugs, convictions by civil authorities and desertion or being absent without leave. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impractical or unlikely to succeed.

(4) Paragraph 14-2c, prescribes Commanders will not take action prescribed in this chapter instead of disciplinary action solely to spare an individual who may have committed serious misconduct from the harsher penalties that may be imposed under the UCMJ.

(5) Paragraph 14-3 prescribes a discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a Soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record.

(6) Paragraph 14-12c prescribes a Soldier is subject to action per this section for commission of a serious military or civilian offense, if the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation and a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts-Martial.

e. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes) provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "JKQ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12c, misconduct (serious offense).

f. Army Regulation 601-210, (Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program) governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI 1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waiverable and nonwaiverable separations. Table 3-1 defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes: RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waiverable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S): The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by Department of Defense Instruction 1332.28.

The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

The applicant contends their separation was unjust due to being undiagnosed, untreated, and unfairly targeted for discharge. The applicant provided a third-party letter from their spouse, their VA providers, parent and documentation of communication with the command team prior to the discharge which described the applicant's mental health status and care need since returning from combat and supported the applicant's contention. The applicant's AMHRR includes no documentation of a PTSD diagnosis. The AMHRR does not include any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The applicant was separated under Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c, AR 635-200 provisions with honorable discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Misconduct (Serious Offense)," and the separation code is "JKQ." Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Processing and Documents) governs the preparation of the DD Form 214 and dictates the entry of the narrative reason for separation, entered in block 28, and separation code, entered in block 26 of the form, will be as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes). The regulation stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for entry of any other reason under this regulation.

The applicant contends the SPD code should be changed. The SPD codes are three-character alphabetic combinations identifying reasons for and types of separation from active duty. The primary purpose of SPD codes is to provide a statistical accounting of reasons for separation. They are intended exclusively for the internal use of DoD and the Military Services to assist in collecting and analyzing separation data. The Office of the Secretary of Defense controls SPD codes and implements them in Army policy AR 635-5-1 to track types of separations. The SPD code specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c is "JKQ."

The applicant contends restoration of their rank to E-5, as the demotion was unjust and improper. The applicant's requested change to the DD Form 214 does not fall within this board's purview. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) using the enclosed DD Form 149 or obtained from a Veterans' Service Organization.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

a. As directed by the 2017 memo signed by A.M. Kurta, the board considered the following factors:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially mitigating diagnoses/experiences: PTSD, TBI, MDD, Depressive Disorder NOS subsumed by MDD, and Unspecified Anxiety State subsumed by PTSD.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board found the applicant is 100 percent service connected for PTSD.

(3) Does the condition or experience excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board determined, based on the Board Medical Advisor's opine, that the applicant's behavioral health conditions mitigate the discharge. The applicant is 100 percent service connected for PTSD, 40 percent SC for TBI, and has additional diagnosis of MDD, Depressive Disorder NOS subsumed by MDD, and Unspecified Anxiety State subsumed by PTSD. The applicant's offenses of wrongful use of marijuana, FTR, and failure to answer a phone for a 2.5 hour period on 1 June are mitigated given the nexus between PTSD and the use of drugs to self-medicate, PTSD and avoidant behavior, and PTSD and problems with authority. The applicant's failing to replicate, failing to keep the planner completed in advance and failing to contact the team leader are mitigated, given the nexus between MDD and decreased motivation and problems with memory and concentration. However, the offense of wrongfully driving a government-owned vehicle to the applicant's residence and making a false official statement, is not mitigated as it is not natural sequela of either PTSD or MDD, and the applicant's TBI was not of a severity to impair cognition, judgement, or behavior at the time of the misconduct.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor opine, the Board determined that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder outweighed the applicant's offenses of illegal substance abuse, FTR, and various dereliction infractions. The Board determined that the circumstances of the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of wrongful use of a government vehicle and making a false official statement did not, in this case, rise to a level to negate meritorious service.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends their separation was unjust due to being undiagnosed, untreated, and unfairly targeted for discharge. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder outweighed the applicant's offenses of illegal substance abuse, FTR, and various dereliction infractions. The Board determined that the circumstances of the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of wrongful use of a government vehicle and making a false official statement did not, in this case, rise to a level to negate meritorious service.

(2) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge should be changed. The Board considered this contention and determined that it was valid. The Board determined that the narrative reason for separation should change to Pattern of Misconduct, as there was not mitigation for the applicant's offenses of wrongful use of a government vehicle and making a false official statement.

(3) The applicant contends restoration of their rank to E-5, as the demotion was unjust and improper. The Board determined that the applicant's request for restoration of rank does not fall within the purview of the ADRB. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR), using a DD Form 293 regarding this matter. A DD Form 293 may be obtained online at <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/forms/dd/dd0293.pdf> or from a Veterans' Service Organization.

c. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder outweighing the applicant's offenses of illegal substance abuse, FTR, and various dereliction infractions. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of a change to the narrative reason for separation to Pattern of Misconduct, with a corresponding separation code of JKA. The Board determined the reentry code is proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service given the current characterization is Honorable and further relief is not possible.

(2) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Pattern of Misconduct, thus the reason for discharge is no longer appropriate. The SPD code associated with the new reason for discharge is JKA.

(3) The RE code will not change given the BH condition(s) and service connection. The current code is consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation.

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

a. Issue a New DD-214: Yes

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000223

- b. Change Characterization to: No Change**
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to: Pattern of Misconduct / JKA**
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change**
- e. Change Authority to: AR 635-200**

Authenticating Official:

6/29/2025



AWOL – Absent Without Leave
AMHRR – Army Military Human
Resource Record
BCD – Bad Conduct Discharge
BH – Behavioral Health
CG – Company Grade Article 15
CID – Criminal Investigation
Division
ELS – Entry Level Status
FG – Field Grade Article 15

GD – General Discharge
HS – High School
HD – Honorable Discharge
IADT – Initial Active Duty Training
MP – Military Police
MST – Military Sexual Trauma
N/A – Not applicable
NCO – Noncommissioned Officer
NIF – Not in File
NOS – Not Otherwise Specified

OAD – Ordered to Active Duty
OBH (I) – Other Behavioral
Health (Issues)
OMPF – Official Military
Personnel File
PTSD – Post-Traumatic Stress
Disorder
RE – Re-entry
SCM – Summary Court Martial
SPCM – Special Court Martial

SPD – Separation Program
Designator
TBI – Traumatic Brain Injury
UNC – Uncharacterized
Discharge
UOTHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions
VA – Department of Veterans
Affairs